

97-84022-9

Sze, F.C.

Is Japan a burning
menace to the world's...

[Champaign]

1919


97-84022-9

MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD



RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35 mmREDUCTION RATIO: 11:1IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIBDATE FILMED: 2-11-97INITIALS: HSTRACKING # : 21529

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

308
Z
Box 64

IS JAPAN A BURNING MENACE
TO THE WORLD'S PEACE?

By

F. C. SZE

University of Wisconsin

The Students' Strike—An Explanation

China's Official Appeal to the United
States Senate

Compliments of

The Publicity Bureau of the Chinese Students

in the

University of Illinois

Is Japan A Burning Menace to the World's Peace?

I

This leaflet addresses itself to the task of answering the query already uppermost even in the mind of a Chinese schoolboy: "Is Japan a burning menace to the world's peace?" In order to answer that question intelligently, we must get at the cold, stubborn facts of history instead of juggling with "official statements" and diplomatic fictions; for whether Japan is one or not is largely a question of fact and hardly a question of opinion or belief, of Japanese denials and Chinese affirmations, or of approval and disapproval by a prejudiced onlooker. Let us therefore face our task candidly—let us, nay, resolve to look this question squarely in the face!—and endeavor to frame such an answer as would occur to an impartial observer of world politics.

For fear that the purpose of this paper may still be wrongly interpreted, the writer feels it necessary to insist strongly at the outset that this is an enquiry, not a propaganda. If the conclusion to be reached turns out to be somewhat positive and startling (even perhaps to none but the writer himself!), the wish has none the less nowhere been father to the thought.

II

But first of all, let it be remembered that what is now called the "Chino-Japanese question" is no longer a local Far Eastern problem, it has already become a world problem which has to be faced and solved justly or else there can be, there will be no lasting peace on this bustling planet. The Great War of 1914-19 has revealed, among other things, the fact that "the world for the first time," in the words of Prof. John Dewey, "now finds itself a round world, politically and economically as well as astronomically." It goes without saying that what permanently injures China must in the end also injure the whole world.

It occurred to me some years ago that China and Japan, being of a kindred race, ought to be able to get along amicably together. Their relations are essentially those of the lips to the teeth. "Destroy the lips," to use the famous Chinese metaphor, "and the teeth are cold." Why then all this fuss and flare up between China and Japan, you may ask? The reason is not difficult to find as it used to be; nor will it appear a bit bewildering when found. The underlying fact lies in the fundamental difference between their traditions

and institutions. The democratic character of one stands opposed to the bureaucratic nature of the other, just as the peace-loving Chinese are antagonistic to the militaristic Japanese.

No one knows better than the Japanese themselves the close similarity between Japan and Germany, which accounts for "a good deal of pro-German sentiment in Japan," in Kawakami's phraseology. According to Prof. W. W. Willoughby, Japanese institutions and traditions are admittedly copied from those of Prussia, while their political philosophy and practices have been strikingly similar to those of that "damnable country." It is therefore not too much to say that modern Japan has been "made in Germany." To put it differently, Japan is the spoiled child of German militarism and imperialism. It is the most significant irony in the World War that Japan, the only autocratic Power now on this democratized earth, fought (or rather fooled) on the side of the Allies.

To return to the characteristic dissimilarity between China and Japan. In spite of their racial kith and kin, or the "likeness of kind" as Prof. Giddings would call it, and in spite of their "geographical propinquity," they stand today as far apart from each other as never before in the history of the world. The present antagonism seems to point that their interests repel each other as strenuously as two like poles in electricity. It is their unlikeness of mind which is at the base of all this strife and contention. With this mental background in distinct relief, we shall proceed to give a brief historical resumé of Japan's imperialistic career in the Far East.

III

The story of the rise of Japan from a lowly pigmy to a powerful giant elicits a shuddering admiration. It was in 1894-5 that she embarked upon her aggressive policy towards China and launched her "Plan of State." Upon the conclusion of the Chino-Japanese War, Japan wrested Formosa and Pescadores from China besides saddling her with an indemnity far exceeding its cost. In 1905-6 she fought Russia for the avowed purpose of maintaining the independence and territorial integrity of Korea; but in 1910 she swallowed the Hermit Kingdom to form a part of greater Japan. At the outbreak of the Great War in 1914, she at once butted in as a belligerent ostensibly on account of the Anglo-Japanese alliance. Ambassador Ishii, unlike most of her statesmen, frankly denied this obligation. An ultimatum was sent to Germany to evacuate Kiaochow and to surrender possession to the Japanese with a view to the eventual return of the territory to China. What was most outrageous was the fact that she violated China's neutrality by landing troops on the northern coast of the Shantung peninsula in spite of China's repeated protests; and the excuse she offered was the German dictum: "necessity knows no law." Not content with military occupation of the railways extending

7 Feb, 1920 - C. R. W.

to Tsinanfu, more than 250 miles distant from the object of her expedition, Japan openly disregarded the territorial sovereignty of China and instituted civil government at various points along the railway line, and even at the capital of the province.

While Europe's hands were thus tied by the war, Japan seized the "golden opportunity" in 1915 and thrust upon China the famous or infamous Twenty-one Demands and threatened her with war in order "to bring closer the friendly relations subsisting between Japan and China!" Space does not permit us to review the scope of these demands, but certain of their general characteristics and of the circumstances attending their presentation, as set forth succinctly by Prof. W. W. Willoughby, may be noted.

"1. In the first place the demands were presented directly to Yuan Shih-Kai, the President of the Republic, and not through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as ordinary diplomatic usage would have required. Yuan was told that he must not divulge the fact that demands had been presented to him, and he was given to understand that if he acceded to them, he might be assured of Japanese aid in the promotion of his own ambitions, but that if he did not accede, the Japanese government would not hold itself responsible for acts that might be taken against him by disaffected parties who as he knew, were to be found in both China and Japan.

"2. These demands, if they had been fully granted by China, would have made China virtually a dependency of Japan, and have been in flagrant violation of the treaty rights of other Powers in China. Especially was this true of the now famous "fifth group," into which the demands of a general and comprehensive character were gathered. So strong in the end became foreign pressure that Japan consented, not to abandon, but to postpone this fifth group of demands for future discussion—a status which they still retain.

"3. The 21 demands were, for the most part, not in settlement of previously pending controversies between China and Japan, and they were not advanced on the ground that Japan had suffered wrongs from China for which compensation was due; nor were there any treaty or other promises obligating China to surrender the important rights that were demanded. The only justification put forward at the time by Japan was that the arrangement proposed would promote peace and good will between the two countries. In short, the demands were nothing more than a list of Japan's wants presented at a time when China was helpless and the other treaty Powers not in a position effectively to object.

"4. When, notwithstanding the injunction of secrecy, it became rumored that certain demands upon China had been made by Japan, the Japanese diplomatic officials denied the fact. When it became no longer possible to maintain this mendacious denial, the Japanese Government officially supplied the other treaty Powers with what purported to be a list of the demands—a list which it presently appeared omitted some of the most important and drastic features.

"5. Finally, Japan, after somewhat revising her demands and postponing, as has been said, the Fifth Group for future discussion, issued an ultimatum couched in the most unequivocal terms, and at the same time took steps to strengthen her military forces in China. 'It is hereby declared,' the ultimatum ran, 'that if no satisfactory

reply is received before or at the specified time, the Imperial Government will take such steps as they deem necessary.' China was thus given no option: she had to yield, and as a result treaties were drawn up and signed, embodying the demands that had been made. And it is upon these treaties that Japan has chiefly relied before the Paris Peace Conference in support of her claims to rights in the province of Shantung."

Such are the significant facts. Regarding recent occurrences, Prof. Willoughby has at least this much more to tell:—

"It is not too strong a statement to say that Japan's record with regard to China has been uniformly, since 1906, an oppressive and immoral one, glossed over by repeated assertions of friendliness, but controlled by the determination to demoralize China and thus provide an opportunity as well as an excuse to increase Japan's political influence and control in that country. Japan can point to no single act on her part that has been affirmatively and disinterestedly helpful to China. On the contrary, in South Manchuria and Shantung, where her control has been predominant, she has permitted extensive smuggling in fraud of the Chinese revenues and to the prejudice of fair competition with the other Powers trading with China; she has allowed the importation and sale of morphia in large quantities, in many cases with the open aid of her consuls, from which large profits have accrued to herself and infinite injury to the Chinese people; she has exported from China, contrary to Chinese law, enormous quantities of copper "cash"; she is the one nation that has arbitrarily refused to allow the Chinese customs authorities to examine postal parcels sent into China from Japan through the post offices which she maintains in China; she alone, during the war, prevented China from taking steps similar to those taken by other nations of the world to conserve her supply of silver; in the tariff revision commission which was recently held at Shanghai to re-value goods for customs purposes, it was her representatives who made it especially difficult to secure for China the effective 5% ad valorem duties which, under treaties, she is entitled to levy; in many well-established cases in Shantung, through her control of the railways and railway zones, she checked the efforts of the Chinese authorities to suppress the brigandage which is prevalent in that province; and, through the importation of arms and munitions and the many loans which her bankers have made during the last three years, she has knowingly made possible the continuance of the strife that has devastated so many of the provinces and made impossible the institution of administrative and financial reforms in China."

This imposing array of Japanese atrocities in China should be sufficient to convince any one of Japan's real intentions and aspirations in the Far East. The world should no longer be kept ignorant of her aggressive policy toward her unoffending neighbor. The continuance of such a reckless course is bound to jeopardize the peace, not only of the Far East, but also of the world.

With the ushering-in of a new international order under the League of Nations, the time has come to call a halt to the "let's grab" policy pursued by foreign nations, notably Germany and Japan, in China. True, England, France and Russia have also played the "game of grab," to use Mr. Ku Hung-Ming's apt phrase; but what

Germany did in 1898 and Japan did in 1915 has passed beyond all precedent. China now pleads before the world to be let alone, to be allowed free opportunities to develop herself; for it is only a free, powerful China that can safeguard the world's peace in the Far East.

IV

Carlyle writes: "Shams are all and sundry of the devil, and poisonous and unendurable to man." It is high time that the sham of the so-called Japanese Monroe Doctrine be exploded. Difficult as it is in these days to talk about such an elusive thing as the American Monroe Doctrine without incurring the risk of misstatement, there can be no doubt that it has had as its foundation the protection of the American continent from the dangerous military movements of autocratic governments. There is a distinctly altruistic and beneficent note in such a doctrine. Viewed in this light, the Japized doctrine is veritably a nightmare. Instead of telling the world in plain everyday language what it means, the Japanese statesmen and publicists are continuously talking Japanese to the West as if the world could thus be fooled.

The crux of the matter is this: The Japanese doctrine is just the antithesis of the American doctrine. True, the outer shell looks the same, but the meat is entirely different. Japan has clearly revealed her intention to keep Korea and China for selfish, corrupt and immoral exploitation regardless of the interests of other nations or of the welfare of her Asiatic neighbors. Pan-Japanism is the real keynote of the Japanese doctrine. Japan is already playing the tune of "Nippon Ueber Alles" in the Far East. If Japan's formula for the world's peace is her hegemony over Asia, then Japan constitutes a grave menace to the peace of the nations interested in China and the struggling Republic herself. A *pax Japonica* could not be a stable peace. In that direction lies war, and the ultimate defeat of Japan's pretensions. Nor is the way for peace to be found in the perpetuation of the existing *status quo*, as has been indicated above, but in reform and development of China into a powerful modern state capable of dealing with other great nations on terms of equality.

In propagating their Asiatic Monroe Doctrine, the Japanese naturally paint China to be another Mexico. This cannot but provoke a smile. They also insinuate that the Chinese are not fit for self-government, whatever that may mean. Now such diplomatic tricks are highly mischievous. The analogy they try to impress upon the outside world is grossly misleading. The very fact that China is the only country that has 40 centuries of continuous history and civilization behind her bears eloquent testimony that she is capable of sustaining existence in spite of all odds. If the bloodless revolution of 1911 which transformed her from a monarchy to a republic

shows us anything, it is this: the Chinese people have virile energy in them to adjust their nation to the world environment. Passing as she does through a hobbledehoy period, she is naturally experiencing many hardships and encountering many obstacles. If allowed full liberty to do what she thinks is right and best for the good government of the people, China will doubtless play an important role that is her due.

Before leaving the fancied Japanese Monroe Doctrine, it is pertinent to call attention to Art XXI in the Paris Covenant for a League of Nations which provides as follows: "Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine for securing peace." One hardly knows what havoc such a meaningful phrase as "regional understandings" may play in the hands of Japanese statesmen. Because of "geographical propinquity," they have already claimed "special interests" as recognized in the Lansing-Ishih notes. That they will assert their pet doctrine under Art. XXI is more than probable. To accept any such interpretation will mean the virtual abdication of the traditional Open Door Doctrine from the diplomatic throne of world politics.

Were it not for the fact that China has been treated, as plainly shown in the Big Three's Shantung award, as a negligible quantity to be dealt with as whim or fancy may direct, the writer need scarcely point out that any settlement of the Chino-Japanese question that does not remove the root of the trouble will inevitably breed war. The Chinese people have suffered enough humiliation and injustice; they can no longer tolerate any more travesty of justice. The 400 millions are rising in a nation-wide protest against what the Parisian politicians euphemistically call "political expediency." The latter have apparently neglected the teaching of the great Chinese sage who admonished: "Uphold the cause of the just and put down every cause that is unjust, and the people will submit. But uphold the cause of the unjust and put down every cause that is just, then the people will not submit." It is well for them to keep constantly in mind that the dove of peace builds its nest only in the haunts of justice.

V

The German menace—thank the Almighty—is at last gone; never to return, let us fervently pray. But in its place we see another one which is no less formidable than the one just gone by. The air is now humming with a new menace which is perhaps just as threatening as the one just past. That new menace on the international horizon, as one must come to the inescapable conclusion, is nothing but the luminous menace of the "Rising Sun." It is not a mere matter of accident that the Japanese menace should raise its head

in the Far East upon the complete shattering of the German menace; for is not the former the logical successor of the latter?

With an unerring instinct to detect "sympathetic" evil and falsehood, the German ex-Kaiser painted for the edification of the Russian monarch the picture of the Yellow Peril at the conclusion of the Chino-Japanese War of 1894-5. What William II had in mind was nothing but the approaching Japanese menace. We are now only beginning to realize the prophetic tone of his presidency. The only Yellow Peril is the "Yellow Hun," and not yellow journalism as the Japanese publicists would have us believe. Being obsessed with a militarism that out-Prussians the Prussian, Japan becomes in many respects more German than Germany herself. In the light of the foregoing analysis, can it be wondered that Japan is a burning menace to the world's peace?

The writer should be wanting in justice if he fails to add at the consummation of this paper that Japan may yet succeed in a change of heart. The present extension of suffrage and the installation of a commoner cabinet under Premier Hara both point toward the rise of democracy in Japan. With this brightening prospect before us, we have every reason to hope that the militaristic itch may yet be removed and the bacillus of imperialism may still be blown out from the Japanese body politic. Instead of being a burning menace to the world's peace, Japan may become by one stroke an immense asset to the peace of the world. That is, the writer feels sure, the sincere prayer of everyone who looks upon the world not merely as a good American, European or anything you will, but also as "a citizen of the world," in the happy Goldsmithian phraseology, under the League of Nations.

The Students' Strike An Explanation

For the first time in the history of China a genuine democratic movement has appeared. The entire Chinese people has risen. No officials head this movement. No great men have attached their names to this cause. Spontaneously out of the schools, among boys and girls, among shop-keepers and merchants, among laborers and coolies, has arisen this historic defense of the rights of China, this demand for good government.

On the anniversary of the Twenty-one Demands when the Chinese people were in mourning because of the shame their country had suffered at the hands of Japan, news arrived that China had been defeated at the Paris Peace Conference. For months previous to this day, since the signing of the armistice, China had high hopes that

she would have an opportunity to develop as a nation, that the wrongs which she had suffered from militarism while the nations of the world were fighting militarism in Europe would be righted. But now China was hopeless. In Peking was a government corrupt to the core. In one year it had borrowed £220,000,000.00 from Japan, ceding to her the richest resources of the land. Coal mines, iron mines, forests, future railroad rights, control of the army, control of finances, control of the few great industries of the country, having been thrown away for a mess of pottage. Great China, the land richest in resources, richest in man-power, richest in territory had become a plaything because of the militarism of Japan and the corruption of her own officials.

The Manchus were driven out by a small band of intrepid revolutionists in league with enlightened officials. But the Chinese people took no part in the first revolution. The monarchist movement of Yuan shih-kai was killed by Peking officialdom. But the people of China were silent. Chang Hsun's attempted restoration of the Manchus was squelched by the very officials who are betraying their country to-day. But the people took no interest.

Since then a Great War has been fought in Europe. On the fields of France and Belgium the fairest sons of the great nations of the west had given their lives that democracy and justice might exist upon the earth. Throughout the world like the voice of a prophet has gone the word of Woodrow Wilson strengthening the weak and giving courage to the struggling. And the Chinese people have listened and they too have heard. They have been told that their four-thousand year old doctrine that peace is the greatest of all aims of a nation has become the slogan of mankind. They have been told that in the dispensation which is to be made after the war unmilitaristic nations like China would have an opportunity to develop their culture, their industry, their civilization, unhampered. They have been told that secret covenants and forced agreements would not be recognized. They looked for the dawn of this new Messiah; but no sun rose for China. Even the cradle of the nation was stolen.

The masses of the people looked toward Peking. There they found only corruption and treason. They looked toward Paris. There they found that a compromise had to be made because of the infection of the question of Fiume and racial discrimination. There is no hope there. They looked toward their own enlightened young men who had studied abroad. They found that they were inadequately prepared to offer a practical plan to save the country. The merchants lacked initiative; they were looking for a leader. And the leadership came from school boys and school girls who were ready to sacrifice their future careers, liberty and life that China might continue to exist. The students of China refused to study, refused to participate in the usual affairs of life until China was

free. They clogged the machinery of the nation. They brought the issue to a head. They demanded immediate restitution of the rights of China and the immediate democratization of the government. These students were Chinese trained. They had never, most of them, left the country. They had not forgotten the nation in the glamour of foreign travel. Their cry was, "sell us, sell everything we have or may at any time have, but let the nation live."

II

Students of Shanghai spontaneously gathered in the Public Recreation ground, West Gate, on May 7. There was no pre-arranged program but before the meeting had proceeded very far it was clear that the students demanded the dismissal of the corrupt officials, the return of Tsingtau to China or effective guarantees by the Allied Nations that Japan would make such a return within a reasonable time, and that the Twenty-One Demands and other secret treaties written between the Peking militarists and the Japanese militarists would be renounced.

Immediately the Shanghai Students' Union was organized. It consists of eighty-three schools in Shanghai and represents 20,000 students, including 5,000 girls.

Similar action was taken in Peking, Tientsin, Nanking, Hankow, Canton, Hangchow, Soochow, Ningpo and other cities in China.

The Peking organization became particularly effective. Peking Government University has during the past year, under the guidance of its Chancellor, Tsai Yuen-pei and other enlightened professors become the intellectual centre of China. The democratization of the Chinese language, the development of a modern Chinese literature, the growth of political discussion centered about the Peking Government University. It was therefore only natural that the Students of this University should refuse to be associated with a government of treason. The Students of the Peking Government University were the first to strike for Chinese freedom. Mandarinlike the Government looked upon this as a schoolboy prank. They threatened. They cajoled. They intimidated. They attempted to bribe. But the students would not return to their desks as long as Tsao Ju-lin, Chang Tsungshiang, Little Hsu and the other traitors remained in power. Came a day when the students marched to the house of Tsao Ju-lin. They wanted to tell him that he ought to resign. Who should be in his house but the arch-traitor, China's Minister to Japan? And in their company was a Japanese. And on Tsao's wall was a portrait of the Mikado. The minds of the Students were inflamed. What new rascality was being hatched? What concession was being bargained away? What mine, what forest, what railroad was Japan stealing at that moment? The result is well known. Tsao Ju-lin ran away. Chang Tsungshiang was beaten almost to death. But much more important was the fact that this demonstration awakened

the entire student body of China to the fact that immediate action was necessary. In every city of China the students left their books and went out on strike.

III

What is it that they demand?

1. First and foremost if China is ever to rise out of her present shameful condition every one of her sons must be taught that treason to his country is man's greatest crime. Chinese officialdom has grown up under the old Mandarin system in which corruption was not only tolerated but expected. The officials were poorly paid and they were to earn enormous incomes by robbing the country. Under the Manchus this system could prevail; in a republic it has no place. The Peking officials have not only sold the wealth of the country but they have betrayed her integrity. The worst enemies of China are not in Tokio but in Peking. Not only to avenge the wrongs that China has suffered must the traitors go, but to prevent the recurrence of treason, to inspire future generations, to set an example for the very boys and girls, the future fathers and mothers of China, who are now on strike, must they be driven out. The fate of the nation depends upon it and with this principle there can be no compromise.

2. China demands that effective guarantees be secured from the Allied Governments that Tsingtau and the German rights in Shantung be returned to her immediately. Tsingtau was stolen from China by Germany. When China entered the war it was understood that this territory would be returned to her. When Japan prevented China from joining the Allies and captured Tsingtau she promised the Government of the United States that she would return the territory to China. The Peace Conference has maintained the principal that territories forcefully seized and unjustly held shall be returned to the nation whose people inhabit them.

The foreigner will say, "But Japan intends to return this territory." China has suffered too long from Japan's intentions. China cannot accept a promise from Japan for it is like a whisper in the wind. China has been betrayed too often by her island neighbor to accept her covenant. She is a nation whose word is bankrupt. One need only think of Korea, of Formosa, of Manchuria, of Mongolia, and of Siberia, to realise the uselessness of a Japanese promise. Japan will never fully, truly, and completely return Tsingtau unless she is forced to do it by the nations of Western Europe. It is to avoid the bloodshed that might be entailed in this use of force that the students want effective guarantees made now that Japan will not be permitted to deceive China in this matter.

3. The Students demand that the Twenty-One Demands shall be cancelled. They were agreed to by China under duress. When the nations of the western world were at war, Japan sneaked in like a thief in the night and demanded that China give up her sovereign

rights. An ultimatum of war was made. What could China have done at that time but to agree to Japan's proposal, made at the point of the bayonet? But these demands cannot be acceded to. China can never agree to the Twenty-One Demands. Until every one of them has been cancelled, China will always be in a state of turmoil. For the peace of Asia, of the world, they must be expunged from history.

4. The Students demand that freedom of speech and of the press shall be preserved as an inalienable right of citizens of the republic. To secure this right the Students desire that the Constitution of China shall be completed and this right included.

IV

To secure these rights the Students have adopted the principle of passive resistance. They are unable to fight against the Peking militarists and enough blood has already been spilled in China. There is no ballot in this country. The only thing that could be done was to strike, peacefully, quietly, but effectively. To strengthen themselves the Students joined with merchants, bankers and laborers, so that if the moment arose when everything else should fail and it became absolutely necessary to force the hand of the Peking militarists there would be unanimity of aim and action in China. Such unanimity exists to-day.

The shops are shut. The banks have closed their doors. The schools are without pupils. Labor is on strike. Can any Government continue to exist in the presence of the unanimous will of the people of the country that the Government should cease to be?

The co-operation of all elements has been secured because everybody in China feels that it is not a question of political party, of social status, of economic condition. To-day China must decide whether she becomes a tributary of Japan or an independent nation. And on that question there is no division of opinion. Four hundred million heads are ready to fall before China will become servile to the Huns of the East.

Allied Friends of China:

Your statesmen are at this moment sitting in Paris trying to mete out justice to the nations of the world. Your sons, your brothers, are lying on the fields of France and Belgium, in the hills of Italy, in the distant snows of Russia to preserve democracy and justice. You have established the principle that militarism shall not prevail. You have given all of your strength to destroy imperialism.

Will you not sympathize with China when she is trying to do in her way what you have done in Europe? China is confronted with the same problem that faced you in 1914. The enemy is at her door. Peacefully, but through trickery the enemy is penetrating into the heart of the country. Already she controls the Government in Peking, the northern provinces from the Siberian frontier to the Yellow River, the island of Formosa and the province of Fukien. Her ad-

vance in the Yangtze Valley is as great as it is appalling. If she be permitted to take Shantung what is left to the people of China?

But the danger is as great for you as it is for China. You have come here honestly to trade and to teach. One need not recite all the crimes that Japan has committed against you in China. You know them well. She has damaged your goods, forged your labels, opened your letters, broken every rule of honest competition. But do you need more proof of what will happen to you in a Nipponized China than what has already happened in Korea, Manchuria, and Formosa. Your missionaries have already been expelled from Tsingtau. Your business will go next.

The Students are now fighting your battle. If they fail now you will have to take up the war against militarism in the East sooner or later. You can prevent their failure by sympathizing with their cause, by bringing pressure on your government immediately to return Tsingtau to China. The students are sacrificing themselves for you as well as for China. Won't you help them to destroy the Hun of the East?

[Beginning from May 4, 1919, there has been a nation-wide boycott against Japanese goods. We publish this article as an evidence of the real feeling back of this movement.—Ed]

China's Official Appeal To The United States Senate.

The representatives of China at Paris have appealed by cable to the United States Senate against the decision of the Peace Conference regarding the award of German claims in Shantung to Japan. As a matter of record and reference this important protest should be printed widely by the press, inasmuch as, under Senate rules regarding unanimous consent, it could not be printed in the Congressional Record. This protest on behalf of China is transmitted under the signature of Eugene Chen for the Chinese delegation at Paris. The text follows:

Important meeting representative of Chinese assembled at Paris decided to appeal to Senate to assist in securing revision of Shantung settlement by speedily passing resolution affirming same to be inconsistent with national honor and interests of America besides incredible injustice to China and danger to world peace.

President's counsel finally brought about China's entrance into war. On him as trustee of American honor China rested hope of settlement enabling her to live untrammelled and unthreatened by Japanese imperialism. August 14, 1917, China declared war. American and Allied governments assured her of their solidarity, friendship and support and promised "to do all that rests with them to ensure that China shall enjoy in her international relations a position and a regard

due to a great country." Proposed settlement is a denial of this and a violation of well defined aim of American foreign policy. Apart from Monroe Doctrine America committed nowhere except in China through the Hay Doctrine of the Open Door with its necessary guarantee of territorial integrity and political independence of China. Doctrine confirmed in Root-Takahira agreement reaffirmed by Lansing-Ishii agreement which introduced, according to a statement issued by Lansing 6th November 1917: "principal of non-interference with sovereignty and territorial integrity of China which generally applied is essential to perpetual peace as clearly declared by President Wilson and which is the very foundation also of Pan-Americanism as interpreted by this Government." This principle of noninterference was stated in terms denying that American and Japan had "any purpose to infringe in any way on the independence or territorial integrity of China" and also in terms declaring that "they are opposed to the acquisition by any government of any special rights or privileges that would affect the independence or territorial integrity of China or that would deny the subjects or citizens of any country full enjoyment and equal opportunity in the commerce and industry of China."

The proposed settlement of the Shantung question is a direct violation of this principle and nothing better established than the German system as to Shantung which included or later consisted of special rights and privileges that affected the independence and the territorial integrity of China besides denying the subjects of other countries the full enjoyment of equal opportunity in the commerce and industry of China in the province of Shantung. Despite these precise provisions of the Lansing-Ishii agreement and the notorious character of the German servitude of Shantung, the American member of the Council of Three has consented to the inclusion in the Peace Treaty of two special articles drafted by the Japanese granting more than originally asked of China and providing that all German rights in Shantung "are and remain acquired by Japan free and acquitted of all charges." This injustice is more glaring when it is remembered that rights whose acquisition by Japan is ordered by the Council of Three ceased to exist since China declared war on the 14th of August, 1917. In the Chinese declaration of war "all treaties of whatever nature between China and Germany" are expressly abrogated. Notice of abrogation was given to America and the Allied powers and none questioned the validity of this act of abrogation.

Such a settlement is also opposed to world interests because a Pan-Asiatic solution of the Chinese question is rendered a certainty. Chinese question involves the issue of whether the manpower and resources of China are to be developed in the interest of the world and human progress or are to be exploited and used for selfish Asiatic ends. If China is free to cooperate with America and the West, the Chinese question will be solved in the interests of the world as a

whole. If China is prevented from developing in cooperation with the West, the Chinese question will be solved in the sense desired by the Pan-Asiatics under the political and military leadership of Japan. Pan-Asiatic development of China is inevitable if the policy embodied in the twenty-one demands continues in operation. The dominant feature of this policy is Japan's claim to be the beneficiary of German ruthlessness in Shantung. As one of the Allied Associated States China has been claiming that the destruction of the German system cannot be limited to Europe, Africa and the Pacific, but must be extended to the Far East. But the proposed Shantung settlement perpetuates the German system in China in circumstances which result in grave and added danger because it replaces Germany whose strength is based on Europe by Japan at the very threshold of China. . .

Korean claim tabulates series of facts showing that this Japanese world conquest has already found expression inter alia Japan's two successful wars against China and Russia which have made her the greatest military power in Asia in much the same way that Prussia's two wars against Austria and France made her the greatest military power in Europe; the annexation of Korea and the Japanese possession of the South Sea Islands north of the Equator bring Japan nearly two thousand miles closer to Australia, giving Japanese navy base dominating practically the entire land areas of the Pacific. The growing subjection of China to Japanese domination through the same methods made the annexation of Korea, in spite of solemn treaties, a "political necessity." This process of subjection will be powerfully assisted by the proposed Shantung settlement which will enable Japan to entrench herself in a vitally strategic area in Intramural China, just as she has already entrenched herself outside the Great Wall in South Manchuria through which lies the quite historic road of invasion into China. In the past Asiatic invaders have entered China from the North and it was through the Manchuria Gate that the last invaders crossed into the great plains of northern China.

It is said that China had to be abandoned in the belief that the President's insistence on a just settlement of the Shantung question might have wrecked the conference and destroyed the League. But this event was only a possibility. Great Britain reversing her policy for an Anglo-Saxon Entente and aligning herself definitely with Japan against America in China where Anglo American interests are faced by Japan's aggressive rivalry.

Also said "the whole future relationship between China and Japan will fall under guarantee of the League regarding territorial integrity and political independence." But if the Senate opposes Article Ten or otherwise the same forces that enabled Japan to triumph today may be expected to enable her to triumph in China though the League exists. This is almost a certainty in view of China's exclusion from the Executive Council of the League, despite strong Chinese expecta-

tion that the President would secure China representative small powers Asia one of the four seats allotted small powers of the world.

The covenant of the League shows it is impossible for Japan to contend that her consent is necessary before China could submit twenty-one demands set forth in the treaties and notes 1915 for the consideration of the League under Article 19. . . .

Holding fast faith in America, we appeal to your Senate to say that the decision of the Council of Three against China shall not be ratified by the American people in Congress assembled for the reason set forth herein and because it involves the violation of the pledged word of the American Government to China and the chief if not only aim of American foreign policy outside the Americas; from this view therefore the equitable settlement of the Shantung question is as much a war aim of America as of China; and the only fair and just settlement of the existing circumstances is that all Germany's rights in Shantung acquired by the council of prime ministers be referred to the League for disposal according to the findings of an international commission appointed by the conference after visiting Shantung and investigating the situation on the spot.

NOTICE

Copies will be given free on application. Address to *The Publicity Bureau of the Chinese Students in the University of Illinois*, 204 E. John Street, Champaign, Illinois.

**END OF
TITLE**